

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated February 9, 2005 are respectfully requested.

THE 103 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,234 (Hunt et al.).

THE PRIOR ART

Hunt et al. teach an improved method and apparatus for accessing Web pages, not only with a single user, but also for multiple user environments. In addition, Hunt et al. teach a method and apparatus for sharing the cache of Web pages among multiple users. After careful study of the teachings of the Hunt et al. reference, the applicants have found no teaching of the streaming of application software or a system of caching the streamed application file pages.

THE PRIOR ART DISTINGUISHED

Claim 1, on the other hand, provides a method for requesting, receiving (and caching), responding to requests for, and sending "streamed application file pages." Streamed application file pages are small portions of an application's code and data that are critical to the application's performance. Claim 1 includes the language "providing caching means on said client for storing streamed application file pages in a cache[.]" Caching of streamed application file pages may be performed, by way of example but not limitation, when one does not want all of the streamed application to be stored in non-volatile memory; doing so may capture the entire application and streaming may become unnecessary. Caching may also reduce the load on streamed application servers and/or improve response time for client system file requests.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP 2143. Since Hunt et al. do not disclose streamed application file pages, claim 1 is allowable over Hunt et al.

In addition, Hunt et al. teaches a method for storing the retrieved pages "in local memory, such as a hard drive" (at col. 2, lines 21-22). Hunt et al. do not recognize, or have any reason to recognize, the desirability of sending pages that are in a cache, as opposed to pages stored in non-cache memory, in order to prevent capture of an entire streaming program. Claim 1 includes the language "said response means sends a packet containing the requested streamed application file page to the requesting client *if said requested streamed application file page is resident in said cache*" (emphasis added). Since Hunt et al. need not necessarily make a determination as to whether a page is stored in cache or not, claim 1 is allowable for this additional reason. Claims 2-11, which depend from claim 1, are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 12 is allowable for reasons similar to those of claim 1. Claims 13-22, which depend on claim 12, are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 23 is allowable for reasons similar to those of claim 1. Claims 24-33, which depend on claim 23, are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

The applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-33.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims pending in the application patentably define over the prior art. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 838-4305.

Respectfully Submitted,
PERKINS COIE LLP



William F. Ahmann
Reg. No. 52,548

Date: August 3, 2005

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, CA 94026
650-838-4300